VISIT…

The Cut of Genealogy: Pedagogy in the Blood

Kathleen Biddick
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

Homo historicus

Imagine it is 1870, the date polemically attributed by Michel Foucault to the birth of the "homosexual."[1] But the "homosexual" is not the only species to emerge from normalizing discourses of nineteenth-century imperial Europe. The institutional historian, *homo historicus*, also arrives around 1870 with such discourses in attendance as examination criteria for the colonial civil service, preservation of the national archive, politics of appointment to endowed professorships, curricular reform, and the cultural production of academic publishing. Consider the English case—the field of modern history was first legislated as an examination field for the Indian Civil Service in 1855 and subsequently inaugurated as an independent honors degree at Oxford in 1872. The doors of the search rooms of the Public Record Office opened to the public in 1866. In the same year, William Stubbs, a churchman and conservative, succeeded Goldwin Smith to the Regius Chair of Modern History at Oxford. The latter had resigned his chair in the wake of the bitter political controversy in England over the Jamaica Uprising of 1865. Academic history writing was also culturally transformed in 1886 when the editorial board of the newly founded *English Historical Review* decided not to remunerate authors, thus cloistering the journal from the lively literary marketplace.[2]

The homosexual and the academic historian are metropolitan twins. Their historical coexistence can help us to understand some paradoxes constitutive of Foucault's genealogical method and his periodization of the history of sexuality. In his famous essay, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," Foucault imagined genealogical history, or "effective" history as he also termed it, as the "transformation of history into a totally different form of time." He

Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies 30:3, Fall 2000.
Copyright © by Duke University Press / 2000 / $2.00.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

eschewed "traditional history" whose temporality is "closed upon itself" and one with itself.[3] Traditional historians divide their continuous time-lines with the arbitrary binary of "that was then" and "this is now." The "now" supersedes the "then."

Foucault held that genealogical history, by the sheer force of its opposition to "traditional history," could uproot "its traditional foundations and relentlessly disrupt its pretended continuity." He believed that his genealogical practice could disrupt, even stop, the return of "eunuchs of history" (traditional historians) whom he, like his muse Nietzsche, despised.[4] Foucault's genealogical method denatures traditional history, yet, paradoxically, the trope of castration—the fascination with eunuchs—inadvertently produces genealogical history as the always already coherent field. He subsequently repeated the image of the eunuch at a crucial moment in the *History of Sexuality*: "Let us not picture the bourgeoisie symbolically castrating itself the better to refuse others the right to have a sex and make use of it as they please. . . . The Bourgeoisie's 'blood' was its sex."[5]

The question of castration and coherence at stake in Foucault's genealogy prompts me to question how genealogical history and traditional history are structured not by radical opposition in his work but rather by relations enabled by their unthought coexistence. Specifically, I wish to relate problems of periodization in volume one of the *History of Sexuality*—especially his model of the supersession of sex over blood—to the colonial space-off of Foucault's work. I shall then question Foucault's argument for the supersession of sex and its disciplines over blood through a discussion of the medieval "blood" laws enacted by the medieval English crown in Ireland. I am interested in how these blood laws seep into the debate over nobility intrinsic to Chaucer's *Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale*. The divided and overlapping technologies of blood laws and pedagogy in this medieval example challenge us to rethink how the colonial space-off is disturbingly internal to Foucault's genealogy.

The ethnological form of genealogy

In spite of his desire to "transform history into a totally different form of time," traditional history most haunted Foucault in his schemes of periodization, the normativity of which has come under the scrutiny of critics such as Michel de Certeau, Homi Bhabha, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick.[6] As early as 1974 de Certeau worried about the "ethnological" *form* (his emphasis) of Foucault's genealogy.[7] By ethnological form he meant Foucault's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

paradoxical strengthening of Enlightenment notions of progress in his "cutting out" and "turning-over" its illegitimate discourses in order to have them serve as a resource for an ethnographic writing of alien bodies. Foucault's genealogical practice inverted the high points of the Enlightenment chronology of progress to one of temporal breaks. Bhabha has shown how Foucault's genealogy collaborates with traditional history, since it fabricates the space in which to locate the "that was then" of regimes of blood.[8] Sedgwick has cautioned that genealogical history has not only reified the conventional premodern/modern divide; it has also reified the "now" as a knowable, coherent temporal field. The temporal *form* of traditional periodization ("that was then," "this is now") thus colonizes the *content* of Foucault's discursive analyses.

The difficulties encountered by genealogy in attempts to transform traditional history into a "totally different form of time" is anxiously apparent twenty years later in the debate over periodization current among historians of sexuality.[9] David Halperin has recently reviewed this "acts-identities" debate as it has come to be known.[10] The controversy is driven by periodization: historians argue over determining the chronological moment when different kinds of sexual acts come to stand for identity, or give information about a person's being. His call for "proper" readings of Foucault notwithstanding, Halperin proceeds to list the terms of what he calls classical, sexual "life-forms," and in doing so partakes in troubling ways of the drive to "specification" that Foucault argued was intrinsic to the normalizing deployment of sexuality in the nineteenth century.[11] Halperin undergirds his inventory with an appeal to conventional periodization:

> I take it as established that a large-scale transformation of social and personal life took place in Europe as part of the massive cultural reorganization that accompanied the transition from a traditional, hierarchical, status-based society to a modern, individualistic, mass society during the period of industrialization and the rise of capitalist economy.[12]

Halperin concludes with an invitation to his readers to return to the nineteenth-century "archives of the library." He assures them the plenitude of the "this is now" to be found there. He writes that the "space of imaginative fantasy that the nineteenth century discovered in the library is not yet exhausted, and that it may still prove to be productive—both for academic scholarship and for our ongoing processes of personal and cultural transfor-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

mation."[13] But the library and archive bring us back to *homo historicus*. These spaces were not "discovered" in the nineteenth century; rather, they were fabricated as national and imperial institutions by and for *homo historicus*. Genealogy and traditional history come full circle in Halperin's essay. What then is to be done to recuperate the utopian threads of Foucault's genealogy?

Sanguinity

The following question may now be posed: How would *The History of Sexuality* work temporally without its built-in notion of a supersession of sex over blood? Foucault argued that "blood was a reality with a symbolic function" and that this reality was eclipsed by a society of sex.[14] Sex did not work as a symbol but rather as an object or target.

> The new procedures of power that were devised during the classical age and employed in the nineteenth century were what caused our societies to go from a *symbolics of blood* to an *analytics of sexuality*.[15]

Foucault used blood as an ethnographic substance to mark the "that was then" of the European premodern, and he read sexuality as the sign of the modern—"this is now." He condensed this temporal binary in the bourgeois body: "the bourgeoisie's 'blood' was its sex."[16] In her brilliant rereading of Foucault, Anne Laura Stoler reminds us that if sex affirmed the bourgeois's body in the European metropolis, blood with its leakage negated its unitary possibility in the colonies.[17] Along the intimate fold of metropolis and colony, a discourse of blood *doubles* a genealogy of sexuality. It is precisely the incommensurabilities of acts and identities and of sanguinity and sexuality, I want to argue, that render other temporalities possible, temporalities not subject to the supersession of "that was then," "this is now." Put more broadly, the intimate fold between sexuality and blood marks what Homi Bhabha has called the resemblance and menace of colonial mimicry: "it is as if the very emergence of the 'colonial' is dependent for its representation upon some strategic limitation or prohibition within the authoritative discourse itself."[18]

The law of blood and the gold of pedagogy

Medieval debates over nobility, a genre that grew in popularity over the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, explored whether one is noble by blood and descent (sanguinity), or through the normative, self-regulating possibilities of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

disciplinarity (pedagogy).[19] A popular, vernacular version of this debate can be found in Chaucer's *Wife of Bath's Tale*. This tale exemplifies a doubled history of sanguinity and sexuality then *and* now. My reading begins with a colonial moment. On 18 February 1366, Lionel Duke of Clarence, third son of Edward III, presided over an Irish parliament that passed the Statutes of Kilkenny. These statutes, which expressed deep anxiety about the Gaelicization of the Anglo-Irish, gathered together and codified a series of prohibitions against the mixing of the Anglo-Irish with the Irish. Most saliently the statutes produced a notion of racial purity by proscribing, under pain of excommunication, any intimate Anglo-Irish alliance with the Irish, whether it be by marriage, godparenting, fostering of children, concubinage, or sexual liason. I define the statutes as a racializing moment, rather than an ethnicizing one, since they prohibited marriage *between* various Christians and denied the Irish entrance into English monastic communities. The statutes thus define both domestic and spiritual miscegenation and in so doing fabricate blood as a juridical substance. One can thus read blood historically as the material racialized *effect* of these statutes. The statutes juridically constituted Englishness, even at the expense of "Christianness."[20]

The Statutes of Kilkenny also further fabricated Englishness through proscriptions regarding language and embodiment. The statutes legislated language laws. The Anglo-Irish were forbidden to speak Gaelic, nor were they to use Gaelic names. At all times the Anglo-Irish were to use English custom, fashion, and mode of riding. The statutes also insisted on the Englishness of ecclesiastical space. No Irish were to be appointed to Anglo-Irish benefices, nor were Anglo-Irish monasteries to accept any Irishmen into their communities. Through this legislation the English crown racialized Irish blood and language and through such judicial proclamation produced English blood and the English vernacular as the sign of Englishness. This juridical work fits squarely with Foucault's notion of the symbolics of blood. Yet, as I shall show, disciplinarity (pedagogy) was always already folded within this colonial symbolics of blood.

The intimacy of blood and pedagogy is revealed in Froissart's account of Richard II's military expedition in Ireland in 1394.[21] Experimenting with the "strange and flattering" vocabulary of majesty and sovereignty that would later prove to be a complaint used to justify his removal, Richard took the submissions of the Irish chiefs. He legally redefined the royal relation to Gaelic Irish subjects in terms of sovereignty and conceived of Ireland as being under *one* lordship.[22] Richard II insisted, for the first time in royal history, that the submitting Irish chiefs call him *Rex*; hitherto

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

English kings had sufficed themselves with a more limited partial form of address: *Dominus Hiberniae*.[23]

Froissart tells how Richard made provisions that the four Irish kings, who had also submitted to him, be instructed for several months in Dublin prior to their knighting in the cathedral: "to persuade, direct and guide in the ways of reason and the customs of this country [England]" [pour eux introduire et amener à l'usage de ceux d'Angleterre] (Brereton, trans., 411; Buchon, ed., 239). Two days before the ceremony, the earl of Ormonde "expounded point by point and article by article the manner in which a knight should conduct himself and the virtues and obligations of chivalry" [et leur remontra de point en point, et d'article en article, comment on s'y devoit maintenir; et quelle chose chevalerie devoit et valoit] (Brereton, 415; Buchon, 247).

This national project of pedagogy did not eradicate the blood upon which it was founded. By this I mean that the Ricardian submissions did not supersede the Statutes of Kilkenny. Rather, pedagogy renders racialized blood as disturbingly internal to its techniques. In its uncanny presence within pedagogy, the specter of racialized blood comes to mark what Homi Bhabha has called the "figure of mimicry."[24]

Bhabha has called this double-time between a racializing moment (here, the Statutes of Kilkenny) and a nationalizing moment of sovereignty (here the submissions) the pedagogical project of the nation. Bhabha argues that pedagogy instills the intimate norms and regulations for the good conduct of the sovereign people.[25] Pedagogy, by claiming that identity is educable, seemingly repudiates the tactic of legislating purity by blood. The juridical enactment of race, that traumatic cut into blood and language, is covered over by locating the symbolics of blood safely in a "traditional" past. Pedagogy facilitates racial projects in the present by other means.

Before turning to Chaucer, I want to spend a little more time with the tale of Froissart's informant Henry Crystede. His personal history, as he relates it to Froissart, spans the time from the Statutes of Kilkenny to the Ricardian submissions and embodies the gendered and split aspects of emergent colonial discourse, especially in his story of how it came to be that he left his eldest daughter behind in Ireland with her Irish grandfather.

Crystede begins by repeating the stereotypes of the barbaric Irish already rendered by Gerald of Wales in the twelfth century. To them he adds purported cannibalism: "and they never leave a man for dead until they have cut his throat like a sheep and slit open his belly to remove the heart, which they take away. Some, who know their ways, say that they eat it with great

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

relish" [et ne tiennent point un homme pour mort jusques à tant qu'ils lui ont coupé la gorge comme à un mouton; et lui ouvrent le ventre, et en prennent le coeur, et l'emportent; et disent les aucuns, qui connoissent leur nature, qu'ils le mangent par grand délit (plaisir)] (Brereton, trans., 410; Buchon, ed., 237). Crystede then goes on to describe how he spent seven years as a captive among the Irish and married the daughter of his host, Brin ("très bel homme"), and bore two daughters with her. During this captivity he learned to speak Irish. At the time of the campaigns of Lionel Duke of Clarence, who was in Ireland to legislate the Statutes of Kilkenny, the English captured, in turn, Crystede's Irish host. The English proposed release in exchange for Crystede and his family (Brin's daughter and his granddaughters). Brin agreed with difficulty ("a peine vouloit-il faire ce marché, car moult m'aimoit, et sa fille, et ce qui de nous venoit" [Buchon, 242]), persuading the English to let him keep his oldest granddaughter. Crystede then returned to the English. At this point he interrupts his chronicle of events to tell Froissart of his daughters and grandchildren:

> . . . both my girls are married. The one in Ireland has three sons and two daughters. The one I brought back with me has four sons and two daughters. And because the Irish language comes as easily to my tongue as English—for I have always gone on speaking it with my wife and have started my grandchildren on learning it as well as I have been able. (Brereton, 413)
>
> [. . . mes deux filles sont mariées; et a celle d'Irlande trois fils et deux filles; et celle que je ramenai avecques moi a quatre fils et deux filles. Et pour ce que le langage d'Irlande m'est en parole assui appareillé comme est la langue anglesche, car toujours je l'ai continué avec ma femme, et introduit à l'apprendre mes enfants ce que je pus.] (Buchon, 242–43)

It is this intimacy within emergent colonialism that the Statutes of Kilkenny would imagine to fix, to fixate. The daughter/granddaughter under the Statutes of Kilkenny is the crossbreed split across its crosshairs of "being English" and "being Anglicized." Chaucer, too, can be sighted within such crosshairs. His life record crisscrossed suggestively with Irish colonial politics and its new "blood" laws. The first documentary evidence of Chaucer comes from the 1360s when he served as a young page in the household of Elizabeth Countess of Ulster and later her husband Lionel Duke of Clarence, during which time the count and countess were in Ireland pro-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

claiming the Statutes of Kilkenny.[26] As a mature author, Chaucer was writing *The Canterbury Tales* as his patron Richard II undertook his large-scale Irish expeditions. Chaucer's *Prologue* and *Tale of the Wife of Bath*, to which blood and pedagogy are central, can be read as a metropolitan rendering of colonial sovereignty in Ireland.

Let us now turn to Chaucer's tale. Chaucer is semantically specific about who teaches and who learns in *The Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale.* Crist (10), the Wife herself (187), her dame (576), and "[R]omayn geestes" (642) teach in the *Prologue.*[27] The Hag alone teaches in the *Tale* and only the Knight and the reader "learn." Chaucer also carefully deploys language around blood. The *Prologue*'s lesson about blood begins with the legal language of accusation. The Wife relates how she flirted with her fifth husband-to-be, Jankyn, by accusing him of enchanting her dreams. She uses formal legal language to make the accusation ("I bar hym on hond" [575]).[28] She relates a dream in which Jankyn slays her and her bed fills with blood. The Wife interprets her dream in direct address to Jankyn: "But yet I hope that ye shal do me good for blood bitokeneth gold, as me was taught" (580–81). The Wife then tells the pilgrims that she made up this dream for Jankyn according to her instruction in "my dames loore" (583). The ambivalence of this dream narration (Did she or didn't she dream this dream?) is mimicked by codicological history, since these lines appear in the Ellesmere version but not the Hengwrt version of the *Canterbury Tales*, both versions possibly written by the same scribe.

The blood that floods the bed of the dreaming Wife and the codicological uncertainty of this dream mark a site of trauma. The Wife's interpretation hastily disavows such trauma by substituting gold for blood, a general equivalent, able to circulate universally, unlike blood, which in contemporary Ricardian politics, as we have seen, had become a juridical substance used to prohibit exchange between the English and the Irish. The violence of the Wife's dream betokens the violence involved in producing a general equivalent, a universal, whether it be gold as a general equivalent for commodities, or Englishness as the general equivalent for sovereign people.[29] Pedagogy enables the Wife to transmute blood into gold. She claims that she fabricated her dream according to the instruction of her dames "loore." Pedagogy, like the gold of her dream analysis, presages profit. Vernacular courtesy books of the late fourteenth century speak of the "profit" of good conduct. Almost a century later, the poetry of Chaucer would become the sign of good conduct as Chaucer appears on the reading list for the well mannered published by Caxton in his pedagogical *Booke of Curtesye.*[30]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

From the blood-filled bed of her prologue with its inflections of a golden pedagogy, the Wife moves on to the question of pedagogy in her tale. She sets her story in a timeless, primitive Arthurian past replete with fairies and archaic identifications with blood. The Arthurian past is a space that operates as a signifier of racial difference between sovereign English metropolitans and the colonized Irish. The Wife recasts the divisions of her own subjugated knowledge of the "old daunce" (476), mentioned in the *General Prologue*, as the ethnographic tableaux of the dance of the "elf-queene, with hir joly compaignye" (860) in the tale. A rape sets her tale in juridical motion, just as a legal accusation had set her dream in motion in the prologue. An Arthurian knight out riding one day saw a virgin whom he raped ("by verray force, he rafte hire maydenhed" [888]). It is against this traumatic screen story (which erases blood by not speaking of it) that the debate for pedagogy in the *Wife of Bath's Tale* will encounter the fascinating scene of racialized blood it was meant to contain. The effacement of the raped maiden can be read doubly through Crystede's account of the splitting up of his crossbreed daughters and Bhabha's concept of colonial mimicry here inflected with gender. The rape, the legal process, and the Knight's quest become part of the mimetic process where the intimacy of split origins must be sutured over: "It [mimicry] is a form of colonial discourse that is uttered *inter dicta*: a discourse at the crossroads of what is known and permissible and that which though known must be kept concealed."[31] Hence the slippery nature of this tale, its double shapeshifting (Hag and Knight), its ambivalence about who is native and who is informant.[32]

By law the Knight would be condemned to death for the rape but for the intercession of Arthur's queen, who sends the Knight on a quest to "seche and lere" [seek and learn] (909) "what thyng is it that wommen moost desiren" (905). In this breathtaking moment of the tale, the silence of the rape is transformed into a pedagogical resource for ethnography. The rape marks the gendered vanishing point of colonial subjectivity; ethnography seeks to restore "perspective."

And so the Knight embarks upon his fieldwork, but he cannot penetrate the secret. When the day comes for the Knight to return to court, he comes upon twenty-four dancing ladies at the edge of the forest. As he "cam fully there" (995) the dancers vanish. All the Knight sees is an old, ugly woman. He asks his question and the Hag makes a deal. She will tell him, if he will grant her next wish. They agree and she whispers in his ear. At court he reports the answer, "wommen desiren to have sovereyntee" (1038), and he is saved. The Hag then makes her wish to marry the Knight known. In shock, the knight offers to give her all his goods in exchange for his release from their pact.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Hag refuses, saying that she is not interested in rich metals ("I nolde for al the metal, ne for oore / That under erthe is grave or lith above" [1064–65]).

I want to pause here at the Knight's offer and the Hag's refusal. In her refusal she seems to be at odds with the Wife of Bath who avowed the substitution of gold for blood in the interpretation of her dream. We might ask at this juncture: Is the Hag in her refusal of equivalence reverting to a "symbolics of blood"? The answer to this question can be unraveled in the long debate over gentility that follows in the tale. The Hag and Knight argue whether one is noble by blood ("if gentillesse were planted natureelly" [1134]) or by deeds ("that he is gentil that dooth gentil dedis" [1170]). The Hag teaches the Knight that nobility is performed through good conduct and is not essentialized in blood as the Knight believes and argues. An apt pupil, the Knight learns his lesson well. He is able to give the right answer when the Hag asks him if he wants her ugly and true, or beautiful and perhaps unvirtuous. His answer magically transforms the Hag into a beautiful wife. The Knight too is also transformed. His Arthurian, "this was then" body, constituted by a symbolics of blood, turns into a pedagogical body whose sexuality is contained within the companionate norms of marriage taught by the Hag.

So far I have argued that *The Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale* concerns itself with anxieties about blood and pedagogy. I have read this tale through a peripheral frame of English royal policy in Ireland, which racialized blood and language and inaugurated a pedagogical project for Irish chiefs whose aim was to Anglicize their intimate daily conduct—from dressing to eating and bearing of arms—and in so doing to affirm Englishness. At first glance the outcome of the debate over gentility in *The Wife of Bath's Tale* seems to advocate a supersession of pedagogy over blood and thus would fit with the paradigm shift from sanguinity to disciplinarity posited by Foucault. The Knight had learned his lessons well. This reading is also the reading of the statutory imaginary of Kilkenny—the crossbreeds (the granddaughter-daughters) can be sorted out and emergent colonial authority be exercised. The fantasy of Ricardian sovereignty magically unifies the split of colonial mimicry—for a moment.

But the happy-ever-after union of the Knight and the Beautiful Lady is not the last word of the tale. The Wife interrupts her ending with her curses. She prays that Jesus will send the plague to those husbands who have failed to learn the lesson of the tale: "And eek I pray Jhesu shorte hir lyves / That noght wol be governed by hir wyves; / And olde and angry nygardes of dispence, / God sende hem soone verray pestilence!" (1261–64). Her curse, too, like the happy union, might be read as the seal of approval for superses-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sion of pedagogy over blood. The fact, however, that the Wife breaks into the Arthurian past of her tale with urgency in the present suggests otherwise. I understand her curse as an acoustical cut into the periodization of her tale, its Arthurian "that was then." Its content, in particular, her imprecations against "skinflints" ("nygardes of dispence"), recall to the reader the interpretative substitution of her dream where "blood bitokeneth gold." Misers are those who, in withdrawing the universal substitute from circulation, insist on a fixed standard of substances. Thus blood becomes blood and gold, gold, and these substances can only supersede each other, rather than their being disturbingly internal to each other's techniques. It is this gap that the Wife wants to keep open. The Wife's curse mimics the menace of the rapist Knight and marks the gendered absence of that rape scene.[33] She breaks the binary of supersession ("that was then," "this is now") and exposes the banality of identifying the past with the racializing of colonialism and the future with national pedagogy.

Chaucer performed the temporality of this gap avowed by the Wife of Bath on his own textual body. In the prologue to the *Tale of Sir Thopas*, Harry Bailey hails Chaucer the pilgrim with a "Hey you! What Man Artow?" (695) asks Bailey, who then answers his own question calling Chaucer a "popet" [a little doll] (701) and "elvyssh" (703). In the excess reverberating in that extra *p* that turns the poet into a *popet*, and in his identification with the not quite human *elvyssh* (Arthurian) world, Chaucer embraces a textual incoherence that defies the foreclosure of supersession. His *elvyssh* textual persona reminds us how history is never one's own, but history is precisely the way we are implicated in the passageways between "that was then," "this is now," between blood and pedagogy.

The Wife's curse and Chaucer's *elvyssh* body conjure a genealogical project for medieval studies. They point to a genealogy that avows the traumatic coexistence of different temporalities and spatialities (the fold of metropolis and colony) that supersession would cut asunder. The eunuchs of history despised by Foucault teach us a cautionary lesson about the "knowledge made for cutting" that genealogy is.[34] No cut is ever a clean one.

Notes

I wish to thank the Stanford Humanities Center (1998–99) for the fellowship support and collegiality that enabled the writing of this essay. A generous invitation from Carla Freccero to speak at the conference "Acts, Identities, and Alterities in Pre- and Early

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Modern Europe" held at the University of California-Santa Cruz (February 1999) offered me the chance to think again about temporality and genealogy. Margaret Greer, John Dagenais, Michael Cornett, and an anonymous reader of this essay helped me to try to clarify the tangled temporal relations of colonial mimicry.

1 Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley, vol. 1 (New York: Vintage Books, 1980), 43: "the homosexual was now a species."

2 For fuller consideration of these interweaving discourses, see the introduction to my *Shock of Medievalism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1998), 1–16.

3 Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. and trans. Donald Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 160 and 152 respectively.

4 Ibid., 158 and 154 respectively.

5 Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 1:124. "N'imaginons pas la bourgeoisie se châtrant symboliquement pour mieux refuser aux autres le droit d'avoir un sexe et d'en user à leur gré. . . . Le sang de la bourgeoisie, ce fut son sexe"; *Histoire de la sexualité* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976), 164. Foucault himself grappled with these contradictions in his genealogical method, and I believe that they can account in part for the surprising aesthetic unities encountered in volumes 2 and 3 of *The History of Sexuality*. This essay does not take up Foucault's *The Use of Pleasure*, vol. 2 of *The History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1985); or *The Care of the Self*, vol. 3 of *The History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1988). Foucault attempts to resolve the genealogical problems discussed in this essay with a problematic pastoral move in volumes 2 and 3, where the body of the Greek homosexual comes to stand for an aesthetic unity. My reading of volumes 2 and 3 is influenced by Suzanne Gearhard, "The Taming of Michel Foucault: New Historicism, Psychoanalysis, and the Subversion of Power," *New Literary History* 28 (1997): 457–80.

6 Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 45–76; Homi K. Bhabha, "'Race,' Time, and the Revision of Modernity," *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 236–56; Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 45.

7 De Certeau, *Practice of Everyday Life*, 64.

8 Bhabha, "'Race,' Time, and the Revision of Modernity," 248.

9 I am inspired by Sedgwick's brilliant critique of historicism in her *Epistemology of the Closet*, which she passionately summarizes on pages 46–47. See also Joan Wallach Scott, "After History?" *Common Knowledge* 5 (1996): 8–26; Graham Hammill, *Sexuality and Form: Judgment and the Body in Renaissance Painting, Literature, and Science; Caravaggio, Marlowe, and Bacon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, forthcoming); and Carolyn Dinshaw, *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1999).

10 David Halperin, "Forgetting Foucault: Acts, Identities, and the History of Sexuality," *Representations* 63 (1998): 93–120.

11 Sedgwick troubles this "will to specification" in *Epistemology of the Closet*, 9. For the list, see Halperin, "Forgetting Foucault," 103.

12 Halperin, "Forgetting Foucault," 96.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

13 Ibid., 112.

14 Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 1:147.

15 Ibid., 1:148 (his emphasis).

16 Ibid., 124. Foucault's binary conjures vampirism (Bram Stoker then and Anne Rice now), and vampires travel from colonial borders to imperial centers and back again.

17 Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's "History of Sexuality" and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1995). Her book is an effort to "identify the changing parameters of a bourgeois self that were contingent on a racially, sexually, and morally distinct range of other human kinds" (18).

18 Homi Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," in his *Location of Culture*, 86.

19 A substantial recent literature on this genre, inspired by Norbert Elias, *The History of Manners*, vol. 1 of *The Civilizing Process*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (New York: Pantheon, 1982), can be located between the following two studies: Barbara Correll, *The End of Conduct: Grobianus and the Renaissance Text of the Subject* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996); and Jorge Arditi, *A Genealogy of Manners: Transformations of Social Relations from the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998). None of these studies, however, explores the relations between the body in civility's *regimes du savoir-faire* with medieval and early modern colonialism. Correll notes, "A sustained and rigorously examined connection between the literature of conduct and civility and the literature of discovery remains to be made" (191).

20 For the Statutes of Kilkenny, see Henry Berry, *Statutes and Ordinances and Acts of Parliament of Ireland* (Dublin: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1907), 430–69. For background, see Robin Frame, "English Officials and Irish Chiefs in the Fourteenth Century," *English Historical Review* 90 (1970): 748–77; and his *Political Development of the British Isles, 1100–1400* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

21 Jean Froissart, *Chroniques de Froissart*, vol. 13 of *Collection des chroniques nationales françaises*, ed. J. A. C. Buchon (Paris, 1825), 235–53; Froissart, *Chronicles*, trans. Geoffrey Brereton (New York: Penguin, 1968), 413–16; hereafter cited parenthetically in the text.

22 The text of the submissions of the Irish chiefs may be found in Edmund Curtis, *Richard II in Ireland, 1394–95, and Submissions of the Irish Chiefs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), 1–118. For Richard's policy, see Dorothy Johnston, "Richard II and the Submissions of Gaelic Ireland," *Irish Historical Studies* 32 (1980): 1–20; Nigel Saul, "Richard II and the Vocabulary of Kingship," *English Historical Review* 110 (1995): 855–77; and Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).

23 As Saul observes in "Vocabulary of Kingship," the timing of Richard II's adoption of a new and inflated language of majesty had to do with his expedition in Ireland and the language of the submissions used there (865–66).

24 Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man," 87.

25 Homi K. Bhabha, "Dissemination: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation," in his *Location of Culture*, 139–70.

26 Martin M. Crow and Clair C. Olson, eds., *Chaucer Life-Records* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966), 13–22.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

27 Quotations of *The Canterbury Tales* are from *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1987). For a brilliant genealogy of Arthurian romance and medieval colonialism, see Geraldine Heng, "Cannibalism, the First Crusade, and the Genesis of Medieval Romance," *Differences* 10 (1997): 98–174. The *repetition* of the Arthurian genre at this later moment of colonialism helps us to understand the importance of repetition to genealogical history. Likewise for a discussion of temporality and the romance genre in the *Wife of Bath's Tale*, see Louise O. Fradenburg, "The Wife of Bath's Passing Fancy," *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 8 (1986): 31–58.

28 The phrase "I bar him on honde" (575) is a formal legal phrase of accusation that appears in Chancery documents. See examples under the entry for *beren* in the *Middle English Dictionary*, ed. Hans Kurath et al. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956). For a broader consideration of the Wife's legal vocabulary, see Robert J. Blanch, "'All was this land fulfild of fayerye': The Thematic Employment of Force, Willfulness, and Legal Conventions in Chaucer's *Wife of Bath's Tale*," *Studia Neophilologica* 57 (1985): 41–51.

29 The violence of substitution of a general equivalent is the subject of Jean-Joseph Goux in his *Symbolic Economies After Marx and Freud*, trans. Jennifer Curtiss Gage (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990). Laurie Finke discusses the economics of transformation in this tale with somewhat different conclusions about the mechanism of violence, since hers is a model exploring supersession of capitalist forms over feudal forms; see "'Alle is for to selle': Breeding Capital in the *Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale*," in Peter Beidler, ed., *The Wife of Bath* (Boston: Bedford Books, 1996), 177–88.

30 Caxton advises the "redynge of books enornede with eloquence." His well-known list includes Gower, Chaucer, Hoccleve, and Lydgate. William Caxton, *Book of Curtesye* (London, 1477–78), ed. Frederick J. Furnivall, Early English Text Society e.s. 3 (London, 1878), 33–38. On profit Caxton writes, "And doubte not my childe withoute drede, it wil prouffite to see such thingis and rede" (43).

31 Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man," 89.

32 My reading is intended to complicate any easy split between the Hag speaking for gentility and the Knight speaking for blood and to mark critically how the native informant needs to be foreclosed in an act of "speaking for." Crucial to my reading is Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999). See esp. chap. 1: "I shall docket the encrypting of the name of the native informant as the name of man—a name that carries the inaugurating affect of being human" (5).

33 Two essays continue to inspire my thinking about the Wife's curse: Sandra L. Richards, "Writing the Absent Potential: Drama, Performance, and the Canon of African-American Literature," in *Performativity and Performance*, ed. Andrew Parker and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (New York: Routledge, 1995), 64–89; and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Echo," in *The Spivak Reader*, ed. Donna Landry and Gerald MacLean (New York: Routledge, 1996), 175–203.

34 Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," 154.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.